

We were involved in 9 DSL installs involving SBC/PacBell, and two POTS phone service installs.

In seven of these, a CLEC was involved. In all 7 cases, SBC either refused to perform work they were required to do, provided false information and refused to correct it, and/or repeatedly failed to complete the work requested. In the four cases where a CLEC was not involved, SBC did the work without any of these problems.

This establishes, in my opinion, a consistent pattern of conduct that these proceedings should rectify. The specifics of each installation support this conclusion.

I won't bore you with those specifics, unless you ask for them. I note that SBC has filed some 152 PAGES of hogwash about claiming that they are not dominant providers of DSL. This is a lie. I don't need to spend 152 pages proving it. I think the above paragraph does fine.

I mean come on! "SBC could not leverage market power from telephone exchange or exchange access services into the mass-market broadband service market"???? (Section title, page 40 in their work of fiction). Yeah, and the earth is flat. In the 6 DSL installs SBC botched up above, SBC was doing exactly that. Intentionally, IMHO.

To date, the FCC, as empowered by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 has done an INADEQUATE job of ensuring competitive telecommunications markets. Further action is required to reduce the roadblocks thrown up by ILECs in the way of CLECs. I suggest that the tools the FCC employs be enhanced by additional tools, including minimum fines to be paid by ILECs to CLECs for violations, in addition to any existing remedies.

I hope that this communication comes to the attention of the FCC (led by Mr. Martin), and not the Oligarchy Preservation Commission (lead by Mr. Powell). :)

Thank you for listening.

Citizen

Ex-Director

Linkify, Inc.

C.T.O.

The Elvey Partnership I.T Consulting Group www.elvey.com/it